

THE BEHAVIOUR OF SLEEVE CONNECTION WITH SPIRAL
REINFORCEMENT AND ADDITIONAL LONGITUDINAL BAR
UNDER DIRECT TENSILE LOAD

NORLIANA BINTI MANAP

A project report submitted in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the award of degree of Master of
Engineering (Civil-Structure)

Faculty of Engineering
Universiti Teknologi Malaysia

JUN, 2009

Dedicated to my beloved husband, Mohd Saruni and my son, Darius Al Hatadi

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Alhamdulillah, in the name of Allah, with His blessing and generosity, I have finally completed this project successfully. First of all, I would like to convey my thankfulness and appreciation to my project supervisor, Assoc. Prof. Dr. Ahmad Baharuddin Abd. Rahman for his excellent supervision, guidance and endeavor in making this project successful; as I gained a valuable knowledge that no book would have written.

Appreciation is extended to all laboratory staff for assisting me in my research activities. Special thanks to Suhaimi, Aizat, and Fadrul for their continuous help during the experimental stage of this study. I would also like to express my utmost appreciation to the Construction Research Institute of Malaysia (CREAM), for their financial support that made this research possible.

My greatest appreciation is conveyed to my husband, Mohd Saruni for his support, encouragement and countless blessing which have always been the source of motivation for me in pursuing my dream. Thank you for the relentless patience and for being always at my side.

And truly deeply thanks to my mother, Normah Bt. Mohd Diah and my family for their love and blessing. Last but not least, my course mates, Yati, Linda, and Shahrul, thank you for the cooperation and encouragement. I sincerely wish you all a bright and rewarding future. Thank you very much.

ABSTRACT

One of the important precast concepts is all the precast elements must be connected for the stability. Therefore, the connection systems of the precast concrete structure must be designed in such a way that its structural performance is equivalent to that of a monolithic concrete structure. In most cases, conventional bar lapping system shows detailing problems due to its long development length, particularly for large diameter steel bars to be embedded in precast concrete structures. As an alternative, splice sleeve connector can be utilized as connection system, splicing reinforcement bars extruded from structural element to ensure continuity among them. However, the existing splice sleeve connectors in the market are proprietary and patented by foreign companies resulting in the high cost of adoption, particularly in Malaysia. Therefore, this research aims to remedy this by developing a new splice connector that is tailored to the needs of the Malaysian construction industry. This new splice connector utilizes a simple transverse reinforcement which consists of R6 spiral bar and welded with four additional longitudinal Y10 bars. This project report summarizes the experimental programmed and also the performance of the proposed splice connector under axial tension. The influence of several parameters of the proposed connector is identified. These parameters include the infill material, reinforcement bar embedment length, spiral diameter and configuration of the additional bar. The experiments examined the tensile strength as well as the failure mode of the connectors. The result shows that the proposed sleeve connector of 33 mm and 58 mm diameter, with at least 200 mm of embedment length could provide a satisfactory structural performance that can develop the fracture capacity of the reinforcement bar. Thus, show that the connector could achieved the required strength with less required embedment length as compared to the conventional lapping system.

ABSTRAK

Satu konsep pratuang yang penting adalah kesemua elemen pratuang harus bersambung untuk kestabilan. Maka, sistem penyambungan dalam struktur konkrit pratuang harus direkabentuk agar pencapaian strukturnya adalah bersamaan dengan struktur konkrit monolitik. Dalam kebanyakan kes, sistem tradisional tindihan tetulang memberikan masalah perincian tetulang kerana jarak besi tertanam yang panjang, dan kesukaran tetulang keluli berdiameter besar untuk ditanamkan dalam struktur konkrit pratuang. Sebagai alternatif, lengan penyambung boleh digunakan sebagai sistem penyambungan, dimana ia menyambungkan tetulang keluli yang terjulur dari elemen struktur dan menjamin kesinambungan diantara mereka. Namun, sambungan jenis ini adalah hak milik syarikat-syarikat luar negara, sekali gus mengakibatkan peningkatan kos pembinaan secara keseluruhan sekiranya sistem sambungan ini digunakan di Malaysia. Maka, kajian ini adalah bertujuan untuk menyelesaikan masalah ini melalui penghasilan suatu sambungan seumpama yang baru serta mampu memuaskan keperluan industri pembinaan di Malaysia. Sambungan baru ini menggunakan tetulang melintang ringkas yang terdiri daripada gegelung keluli R6 yang dikimpal bersama empat tetulang tambahan memanjang, Y10. Laporan projek ini merumuskan perjalanan ujikaji serta pencapaian sambungan baru tersebut di bawah beban tegangan pugak serta kesannya terhadap pengaruh beberapa parameter kajian seperti bahan pengisi, jarak tetulang keluli yang tertanam, diameter gegelung dan kedudukan tetulang tambahan. Kekuatan tegangan dan bentuk kegagalannya turut dikenalpasti. Hasil kajian menunjukkan sambungan yang menggunakan diameter gegelung 33 mm dan 58 mm dengan sekurang-kurangnya 200 mm panjang tetulang yang tertanam, memberikan pencapaian struktur yang memuaskan dimana ia menyebabkan kegagalan terikan pada tetulang keluli. Ini menunjukkan penyambung tersebut mampu mencapai kekuatan yang diperlukan pada jarak besi tertanam yang lebih pendek berbanding sistem pertindihan tradisional.

TABLE OF CONTENT

CHAPTER	TITLE	PAGE
	DECLARATION	ii
	DEDICATIONS	iii
	ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iv
	ABSTRACT	v
	ABSTRAK	vi
	TABLE OF CONTENTS	vii
	LIST OF TABLES	x
	LIST OF FIGURES	xi
	LIST OF SYMBOLS	xv
I	INTRODUCTION	1
	1.1 An overview on splice sleeve connector	1
	1.2 Problem statement	2
	1.3 Objective of study	3
	1.4 Scope of study	3
	1.5 Significant of study	3
II	LITERATURE REVIEW	5
	2.1 Introduction	5
	2.2 Grouted splice sleeve	6
	2.2.1 NMB Splice-Sleeve® Systems	7
	2.2.2 LENTON® INTERLOCK	9
	2.3 Bond stress	11
	2.4 Confinement	13

2.4.1	The influence of confinement on bond behaviour	15
2.4.2	The influence of transverse reinforcement on confinement	18
2.5	Code Provision for Design	21
III	METHODOLOGY	23
3.1	Introduction	23
3.2	Specimens preparation	24
3.2.1	Control specimens	27
3.2.2	Series 1 specimens	29
3.2.3	Series 2 specimens	31
3.2.4	Series 3 specimens	34
3.2.5	Series 4 specimens	36
3.3	Material specification	38
3.3.1	High yield reinforcement bar	38
3.3.2	Spiral reinforcement bar	38
3.3.3	PVC pipe	39
3.3.4	Infill materials	40
3.3.4.1	Sika grout	40
3.3.4.2	Mortar	41
3.3.4.3	Concrete	41
3.4	Equipment and instrumentation	43
3.4.1	Compressive test	43
3.4.2	Single-bar tensile test	43
3.4.3	Direct tensile test	44
IV	TEST RESULTS	46
4.1	Introduction	46
4.2	Tensile test results of control specimens	46
4.2.1	Y16 reinforcement bar	47
4.2.2	Splice sleeve	48
4.3	Tensile test results of Series 1 specimens	51

4.3.1	Specimens ‘A’ – Sika grout infill	51
4.3.2	Specimens ‘B’ – Mortar infill	56
4.3.3	Specimens ‘C’ – Concrete infill	59
4.4	Tensile test results of Series 2 specimens	62
4.5	Tensile test results of Series 3 specimens	68
4.6	Tensile test results of Series 4 specimens	74
V	DISCUSSION OF RESULTS	80
5.1	Introduction	80
5.2	Bond Stress	80
5.2.1	Code Provisions for Design	81
5.3	Effect of test variable on behaviour	83
5.3.1	Effect of infill material	83
5.3.2	Effect of diameter spiral reinforcement bar	85
5.3.3	Effect of the configuration of additional longitudinal bars, 4Y10	86
5.3.3	Effect of embedment length	87
V1	CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATION	91
6.1	Introduction	91
6.2	Conclusions	91
6.3	Recommendations	93
	REFERENCES	95

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE NO.	TITLE	PAGE
3.1	Detailing of control specimens	28
3.2	Detailing of Series 1	30
3.3	Detailing of Series 2	33
3.4	Detailing of Series 3	35
3.5	Detailing of Series 4	37
3.6	Grade of Mortar provided by BS 5628	41
3.7	Concrete mix design	42
4.1	Summary of Tensile Test Result for Control Specimen: Single Y16 Bar	47
4.2	Summary of Tensile Test Result for Control Specimen: Splice Sleeve	49
4.3	Summary of Performance for Series 1 : Specimen 'A'	52
4.4	Summary of Performance for Series 1 : Specimen 'B'	56
4.5	Summary of Performance for Series 1 : Specimen 'C'	60
4.6	Summary of Performance for Series 2	63
4.7	Summary of Performance for Series 3	69
4.8	Summary of Performance for Series 4	74
5.1	Summary of bond stresses	81

LIST OF FIGURES

FIGURE NO.	TITLE	PAGE
2.1	Lap splicing connection	6
2.2	Mechanical splicing connections	6
2.3	Typical splice sleeve connector	7
2.4	NMB Splice-Sleeve® Connector and SS Mortar®	8
2.5	LENTON® INTERLOCK	9
2.6	A series of walls connected using LENTON® INTERLOCK (Albrigo et al., 1995)	10
2.7	Development of anchorage length of reinforced concrete.	11
2.8	Bond and splitting components of rib bearing stresses	12
2.9	Bond Stress Distributions	13
2.10	Active confinement in a beam end bearing (Thomsons et. al, 2002)	14
2.11	Confinement steel in the vicinity of a splitting crack Modified Ring Tension Fields (Thomsons et. al, 2002)	15
2.12	Crack width of splitting cracks (Thomsons et. al, 2002)	15
2.13	Bond failure by (a) split cracking in unconfined concrete and (b) pullout in confined concrete (Soroushian et al., 1991)	16
2.14	Details of test specimens (Einea et al., 1995)	17
2.15	Free body diagrams for Type 3 specimen (Einea et al., 1995)	18
2.16	Bond stress-slip relationships with different transverse reinforcement spacings (Soroushian et al., 1991)	19
2.17	Bond stress-slip relationships with different transverse reinforcement areas (Soroushian et al., 1991)	19

2.18	Typical failure pattern for pullout test: (a) without stirrups (b) with stirrups (Ichinose et al., 2004)	20
2.19	Effect of Transverse Reinforcement on Splice Strength. Tepfers (1973)	21
3.1	Flowchart of Methodology	24
3.2	Example of complete connection cross section	25
3.3	Splice sleeve components	26
3.4	Holding the reinforcement bars in position	26
3.5	Casting Process	27
3.6	The configuration of reinforcement bars for control specimens	28
3.7	The arrangement of reinforcement bars in the PVC pipe before casting	28
3.8	The configuration of spiral reinforcement bars for Series 1	29
3.9	The arrangement of reinforcement bar and spiral reinforcement bar in the PVC pipe before casting	31
3.10	Series 1 after filled	31
3.11	Various configuration of spiral reinforcement bar for Series 2	32
3.12	From top : Specimens D2, D3, and D(3)2	32
3.13	Series 2 after grouting	32
3.14	From top : Specimens E3(2), E3, and E2	34
3.15	Series 3 after grouting	34
3.16	From top : Specimens F3(2), F3, and F2	36
3.17	Series 4 after grouting	36
3.18	Y10 bars are welded inside the spiral bar	38
3.19	Y10 bars are welded outside the spiral bar	39
3.20	Red circle shows the welded between Y10 bars and the spiral	39
3.21	PVC pipe dimension	39
3.22	PVC pipe with different length	40
3.23	Sika Grout-215	41
3.24	(a) Concrete Compression Machine (b) Cube under Compression Test	43
3.25	Single bar Tensile Test	44
3.26	Experimental setup of the specimen	45

3.27	Data Logger	45
4.1	Load versus Displacement graph for Control Specimen: Y16 Single Bar	45
4.2	Stress versus Strain graph for Control Specimen : Y16 Bar	45
4.3	Load versus Displacement graph for control specimen: splice sleeve	48
4.4	Grout broke apart at Control Specimen, CC00	49
4.5	Grout cracked and slipped bar at control specimen, CC01	50
4.6	Grout failure at control specimen, CC02	50
4.7	Failure modes of Series 1 (From left; Specimens A1, A2, A3, A3(2), A4, A4(2), and A5)	51
4.8	Graph of Load (kN) versus Displacement (mm) for Series 1:Specimens 'A'	53
4.9	Bar fractured at specimen A4(2)	54
4.10	Cracking pattern at Series 1 : A2, A4, and A3(2) Specimens	54
4.11	Radial cracks at top and bottom face of Series 1:Specimens 'A'	55
4.12	Slippage failures at Specimen A5	55
4.13	Graph of Load (kN) versus Displacement (mm) for Series1:Specimens'B'	57
4.14	Failure modes of Series 1 (From right; Specimens B1, B2, B3, B3(2), B4, B4(2), and B5)	57
4.15	Cracking pattern at Series 1 : B2, B1, and B3 Specimens	58
4.16	Radial cracks at top and bottom face of Series 1:Specimens 'B'	58
4.17	Graph of Load (kN) versus Displacement (mm) for Series1:Specimens'C'	59
4.18	Failure modes of Series 1 (From right; Specimen C1, C2, C3, C3(2), BC, C4(2), and C5)	61
4.19	Honeycomb between the spiral bar and Y16 reinforcement bar at C2 specimen	61
4.20	Graph of Load (kN) versus Displacement (mm) for Series2	62
4.21	Failure modes of D2 Specimen	64
4.22	Stress versus Strain graph for D2 Specimen	65
4.23	Failure modes of D3 Specimen	66

4.24	Stress versus Strain graph for D3 Specimen	66
4.25	Failure modes of Specimen D3(2)	67
4.26	Stress versus Strain graph for D3(2) Specimen	67
4.27	Graph of Load (kN) versus Displacement (mm) for Series 3	68
4.28	Failure modes of E2 Specimen	70
4.29	Stress versus Strain graph for E2 Specimen	71
4.30	Failure modes of E3 Specimen	72
4.31	Stress versus Strain graph for E2 Specimen	72
4.32	Failure modes of E3(2) Specimen	73
4.33	Stress versus Strain graph for E3(2) Specimen	73
4.34	Graph of Load (kN) versus Displacement (mm) for Series 4	75
4.35	Failure modes of F2 Specimen	76
4.36	Stress versus Strain graph for F2 Specimen	77
4.37	Failure modes of F3 Specimen	77
4.38	Stress versus Strain graph for F3 Specimen	78
4.39	Failure modes of F3(2) Specimen	78
4.40	Stress versus Strain graph for F3(2) Specimen	79
5.1	Graph of Load (kN) versus Displacement (mm) for Series1: Specimens '4' and '4(2)'	84
5.2	Graph of Ultimate Load (kN) versus Spiral Code for Series1	85
5.3	Cross section of B3, B3(2), and B4 specimen	87
5.4	Graph of Ultimate Load (kN) versus Embedment Length (mm)	88
5.5	Bond Stresses at failure versus embedment length	89

LIST OF SYMBOLS

θ	-	Bond angle
U	-	Bond strength of concrete
f_n	-	Lateral confining pressure
f_c'	-	Concrete compressive strength
T_s	-	Tangential force in a small length Δl of the pipe
t	-	Tangential strain in the pipe
l	-	Small longitudinal length of the pipe
E	-	Modulus of elasticity of the pipe
d_i	-	Inside diameter of the pipe
f_{bu}	-	Bond stress
β	-	Coefficient dependent on the bar type
f_{cu}	-	Infill compressive strength
P	-	Failure load
φ_e	-	Nominal bar diameter
L_d	-	Embedment length

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

1.1 An overview on splice sleeve connector

The successful structural performance of precast concrete systems depends on the connection behaviour. Improper connections among structural members will lead to failure of structures. The configuration of the connection affects the constructability, stability, strength, flexibility and residual forces in the structure. A good connection system for precast concrete structures should not consume much space within the available dimensions of the structural elements to avoid congesting of reinforcement bars and to reduce complexity during fabrication. The method and erection process should also be simple to reduce the requirement of the manpower for the construction. Besides, the analysis and design method should be reliable and accurate for economical purpose.

Several splice methods have been invented to fulfill the requirement of lapped length for the continuity of reinforcement bars and one of those inventions is by the use of grouted splice sleeve connector. The sleeve is made either by available steel pipes or specially designed steel mould. The basic concept of this connection is two steel bars are inserted into the sleeve connector from both ends to meet at mid length of the sleeve. The purpose of the steel bars is to provide continuity for the tensile forces. Then, high strength grouts are poured into the sleeve as bonding material and simultaneously, perform as load transferring medium in the sleeve connector.

The splicing methods can be used as connection system in precast wall panels. The splice sleeve connectors are cast together with prefabricated wall panels. Then, the extruded vertical reinforcement bar from the upper wall panels will be properly inserted into the sleeve connector located at lower wall panels. By proper installation of the connection, the sleeves are able to develop the full strength of the bars and continuity of reinforcement between upper and lower precast wall panels (PCI Committee, n.d.).

1.2 Problem statement

In precast concrete structures, attention should be given to connections and joints. Joints can rightly be asserted as the weakest and the most critical points of a precast concrete structure especially in terms of bonding between the reinforcement and concrete (Korkmaz and Tankut, 2005). When a reinforced concrete structure is subjected to severe load, where the localized bond demand exceeds its capacity, localized damage and significant movement between reinforcing steel and the surrounding concrete will occur. Therefore, the connection systems of the precast concrete structure must be designed in such a way that its structural performance is equivalent to that of a conventionally designed, cast-in-place, monolithic concrete structure (ACI Committee 550, n.d.).

In normal practice of precast wall, continuity between upper precast walls and lower precast walls are carried out by lapping the reinforcement bars. However, this practice often caused congestion in the connection and may created honeycomb or voids in concrete if precaution is not taken during concreting. Therefore, the splice sleeves have been invented to eliminate these problems. However, such splice sleeve connectors usually require a special casting process due to the complexity of the sleeve designs. Furthermore, the splice sleeve connectors available in the market usually require a specially designed, high strength cementitious grout. Besides, this type of connectors could only be purchased from foreign companies and therefore, the overall cost of adopting splice sleeve connection system would probably outweigh the savings gained as mentioned above.

1.3 Objective of study

The specific objectives of this study are as follows:

- i. To identify the performance of the sleeve connector with spiral reinforcement and additional longitudinal bar as an alternative method for traditional reinforcing bars lapping in connection for precast concrete wall panels.
- ii. To investigate the failure modes of the sleeve connectors to understand the factors that govern their tensile capacity.

1.4 Scope of study

The scope of work will focus on studying the behaviour of sleeve connector with spiral reinforcement bar and additional bar for precast wall panel connections. To carry out the objectives, 30 specimens with various spiral diameters, length, and configurations were prepared and loaded under axial tension. Two bars of Y16 were aligned at the centre of the sleeve connector from an end, contacting to each other from the other end at the mid span of the sleeve connector. Their failure modes, as well as the failure mechanisms were investigated in order to understand the factors that govern their capacity.

1.5 Significant of study

The successful structural performance of precast concrete system depends on the connection behaviour. Improper connections among structural members will lead to failure of structures. In this study, laboratory testing will be conducted to assess the behaviour and performance of the sleeve connection with spiral reinforcement and additional longitudinal bar by studying the load-displacement

relationships, stress-strain relationships and failure modes of the connections. The characteristic and behaviour of the proposed connections can be acquired so that they can be applied in Industrialized Building Systems (IBS) as an alternative for conventional cast in-situ reinforced concrete structures. The application of sleeve connectors in precast concrete structures can accelerate the speed of erection, significantly reduce the required reinforcement bar lap length, and guarantees higher quality assurance.

REFERENCE

ACI Committee 439 (1991). "Mechanical Connections of Reinforcing Bars." *ACI Structural Journal*. March - April, pp. 222-237.

ACI Committee 550, ACI 550.1R-01 report – "Emulating Cast-in-Place Detailing in Precast Concrete Structures."

Albrigo, J., Ricker, E.D., & Colarusso, L.J. (1995). "Reinforcing Bar Splice and System for Forming Precast Concrete Members and Structures." U.S. Patent No. 5,468,524.

Astrova, T. I., Dmitriev, S. A., and Mulin, N. M. (1961). "The Anchorage of Deformed Reinforcing Bars in Ordinary and Prestressed Reinforced Concrete." Moscow: Transactions of the Scientific-Research Institute of Concrete and Reinforced Concrete of the Academy of Building and Architecture, issue 23.

British Standard Institution (1997). "Structural Use of Concrete BS8110: Part 1: 1997." London.

Ciampi, V., Eligehausen, R., Popov, E.P., & Bertero, V.V. (1982). "Analytical model for Concrete Anchorages of Reinforcing Bars under Generalized Excitations." Report No. UCB/EERC-82/83, Earthquake Engineering Research Center, University of California, Berkeley, 103 pp.

Cox, J.V. & Herrmann, L.R. (1998). "Development of a Plasticity Bond Model for Steel Reinforcement." *Mechanics of Cohesive-Frictional Materials*, John Wiley & Sons, Ltd., pp. 155-180

Einea, A., Yamane, T., Tadros, M. K. (1995). "Grout-filled Pipe Splices for Precast Concrete Construction." *PCI Journal*, January – February, pp. 82-93

Eligehausen, R., Popov, E. P., and Bertero, V. V. (1983). "Local Bond Stress-Slip Relationship of Deformed Bars Under Generalized Excitations." Report No.

UCB/EERC-83/23, Earthquake Engineering Research Center, University of California, Berkeley, CA.

ERICO, LENTON® INTERLOK – Product Brochure.

Ferguson, P. M., Breen, J. E., and Jirsa, J. O. (1988). “Reinforced Concrete Fundamentals.” 5th edition, New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Hartland, R. A. (1975). “Design of Precast Concrete.” London: Surrey University Press.

Hungspreug, S. (1981). “*Local Bond Between a Steel Bar and Concrete Under High Intensity Cyclic Load.*” Cornell University: Phd Thesis, pp. 449.

Ichinose, T., Kanayama, Y., Inoue, Y. & Bolander Jr., J.E. (2004). “Size Effect on Bond Strength of Deformed Bars.” Construction and Building Materials, Elsevier Ltd., pp. 549-558.

Lutz, L. A., and Gergely, P. (1967). “Mechanics of Bond and Slip of Deformed Bars in Concrete.” Journal of the American Concrete Institute, *Proceedings* V. 64, No. 11.

M.K. Thompson, J.O.Jirsa, J.E. Breen, R.E. Klingner (2002). “Anchorage Behaviour of Headed Reinforcement.”

NMB Splice-Sleeve Systems-Product Brochure, Splice Sleeve North America, Inc., Ontario, California.

Philips, W.R. and Sheppard, D.A. (1980). “Plant Precast and Prestressed Concrete.” California, U.S.A.: The Prestressed Concrete Manufacturers Association of California, Inc., pp.1-5, 29-31.

SSNA, General Brochure of NMB Splice Sleeve ® Systems.

- Soroushian, P. & Choi, K.B. (1989). "Local Bond of Deformed Bars with Different Diameters in Confined Concrete." *ACI Structural Journal*, March-April, pp. 217-222.
- Soroushian, P., Choi, K.B., Park, G.H. & Aslani, F. (1991). "Bond of Deformed Bars to Concrete: Effects of Confinement and Strength of Concrete." *ACI Materials Journal*, May-June, pp. 227-232.
- Tepfers, R. (1973). "A Theory of Bond Applied to Overlapped Tensile Reinforcement Splices for Deformed Bars." Publication No. 73:2, Division of Concrete Structures, Chalmers University of Technology, Göteborg.
- Untrauer, R. E. & Henry, R. L. (1965). "Influence of Normal Pressure on Bond Strength." *ACI Journal*, May, pp. 577-586.
- Viwathanatepa, S., Popov, E. P., and Bertero, V. V. (1979). "Effects of Generalized Loadings on Bond of Reinforcing Bars in Confined Concrete Blocks." Report No. UCB/EERC-79/22, Earthquake Engineering Research Center, University of California, Berkeley, CA.
- Yee, A. A. (1986). "Splice Sleeve for Reinforcing Bars with Cylindrical Shell." U.S. Patent No. 4,627,212.